

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					under Ohio law and the federal claims could be adequately raised in an action under 42 U.S.C.S. § 1983. On appeal, the Ohio Supreme Court held that dismissal was proper, as the complaint actually sought declaratory and injunctive relief, rather than mandamus relief. Further, election--contest actions were the exclusive remedy to challenge election results. An adequate remedy existed			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					under § 1983 to raise the federal-law claims. Affirmed.			
Fla. Democratic Party v. Hood	United States District Court for the Northern District of Florida	342 F. Supp. 2d 1073; 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 21720	October 21, 2004	Plaintiff political party sought injunctive relief under the Help America Vote Act, claiming that the election system put in place by defendant election officials violated HAVA because it did not allow provisional voting other than in the voter's assigned precinct. The officials moved for judgment on the pleadings.	The political party asserted that a prospective voter in a federal election had the right to cast a provisional ballot at a given polling place, even if the local officials asserted that the voter was at the wrong polling place; second, that voter had the right to have that vote counted in the election, if the voter otherwise	No	N/A	No

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					met all requirements of state law. The court noted that the right to vote was clearly protectable as a civil right, and a primary purpose of the HAVA was to preserve the votes of persons who had incorrectly been removed from the voting rolls, and thus would not be listed as voters at what would otherwise have been the correct polling place. The irreparable injury to a voter was easily sufficient to			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					outweigh any harm to the officials. Therefore, the court granted relief as to the first claim, allowing the unlisted voter to cast a provisional ballot, but denied relief as to the second claim, that the ballot at the wrong place must be counted if it was cast at the wrong place, because that result contradicted State law. The provisional ballot could only be counted if it			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					was cast in the proper precinct under State law.			
League of Women Voters v. Blackwell	United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio	340 F. Supp. 2d 823; 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 20926	October 20, 2004	Plaintiff organizations filed suit against defendant, Ohio's Secretary of State, claiming that a directive issued by the Secretary contravened the provisions of the Help America Vote Act. The Secretary filed a motion to dismiss.	The directive in question instructed election officials to issue provisional ballots to first--time voters who registered by mail but did not provide documentary identification at the polling place on election day. When submitting a provisional ballot, a first--time voter could identify himself by providing his driver's license number or the	No	N/A	No

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					last four digits of his social security number. If he did not know either number, he could provide it before the polls closed. If he did not do so, his provisional ballot would not be counted. The court held that the directive did not contravene the HAVA and otherwise established reasonable requirements for confirming the identity of first-time voters who registered to vote by mail because: (1) the			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					identification procedures were an important bulwark against voter misconduct and fraud; (2) the burden imposed on first-time voters to confirm their identity, and thus show that they were voting legitimately, was slight; and (3) the number of voters unable to meet the burden of proving their identity was likely to be very small. Thus, the balance of interests favored the directive,			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					even if the cost, in terms of uncounted ballots, was regrettable.			
Sandusky County Democratic Party v. Blackwell	United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit	386 F.3d 815; 2004 U.S. App. LEXIS 28765	October 23, 2004	Defendant Ohio Secretary of State challenged an order of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio, which held that Ohio Secretary of State Directive 2004--33 violated the federal Help America Vote Act. In its order, the district court directed the Secretary to issue a revised directive that conformed to HAVA's requirements.	On appeal, the court held that the district court correctly ruled that the right to cast a provisional ballot in federal elections was enforceable under 42 U.S.C.S. § 1983 and that at least one plaintiff had standing to enforce that right in the district court. The court also held that Ohio Secretary of State Directive	No	N/A	No

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					2004--33 violated HAVA to the extent that it failed to ensure that any individual affirming that he or she was a registered voter in the jurisdiction in which he or she desired to vote and eligible to vote in a federal election was permitted to cast a provisional ballot. However, the district court erred in holding that HAVA required that a voter's provisional ballot be counted as a			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					valid ballot if it was cast anywhere in the county in which the voter resided, even if it was cast outside the precinct in which the voter resided.			
Hawkins v. Blunt	United States District Court for the Western District of Missouri	2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 21512	October 12, 2004	In an action filed by plaintiffs, voters and a state political party, contending that the provisional voting requirements of Mo. Rev. Stat. § 115.430 conflicted with and was preempted by the Help America Vote Act, plaintiffs and defendants, the secretary of state and others, moved	The court held that the text of the HAVA, as well as its legislative history, proved that it could be read to include reasonable accommodations of state precinct voting practices in implementing provisional voting requirements.	No	N/A	No

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				for summary judgment.	The court further held that Mo. Rev. Stat. § 115.430.2 was reasonable; to effectuate the HAVA's intent and to protect that interest, it could not be unreasonable to direct a voter to his correct voting place where a full ballot was likely to be cast. The court also held that plaintiffs' equal protection rights were not violated by the requirement that before a voter would be allowed to cast a provisional			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					ballot, the voter would first be directed to his proper polling place.			
Bay County Democratic Party v. Land	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan	340 F. Supp. 2d 802; 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 20551	October 13, 2004	Plaintiffs, state and county Democratic parties, filed an action against defendant, Michigan secretary of state and the Michigan director of elections, alleging that the state's intended procedure for casting and counting provisional ballots at the upcoming general election would violate the Help America Vote Act and state laws implementing the federal	The parties claimed that if the secretary's proposed procedure was allowed to occur, several voters who were members of the parties' respective organizations were likely to be disenfranchised. Defendants moved to transfer venue of the action to the Western District of Michigan claiming that the only proper	No	N/A	No

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				legislation. Defendants filed a motion to transfer venue.	venue for an action against a state official is the district that encompasses the state's seat of government. Alternatively, defendants sought transfer for the convenience of the parties and witnesses. The court found that defendants' arguments were not supported by the plain language of the current venue statutes. Federal actions against the Michigan secretary of state over rules and practices			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					governing federal elections traditionally were brought in both the Eastern and Western Districts of Michigan. There was no rule that required such actions to be brought only in the district in which the state's seat of government was located, and no inconvenience resulting from litigating in the state's more populous district reasonably could be claimed by a state official who had a			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					mandate to administer elections throughout the state and operated an office in each of its counties. Motion denied.			
Bay County Democratic Party v. Land	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan	347 F. Supp. 2d 404; 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 20872	October 19, 2004	Plaintiffs, voter organizations and political parties, filed actions against defendants, the Michigan Secretary of State and her director of elections, challenging directives issued to local election officials concerning the casting and tabulation of provisional ballots. Plaintiffs sought a	The court concluded that (1) plaintiffs had standing to assert their claims; (2) HAVA created individual rights enforceable through 42 U.S.C.S. § 1983; (3) Congress had provided a scheme under HAVA in which a voter's right to have a	No	N/A	No

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				preliminary injunction and contended that the directives violated their rights under the Help America Vote Act.	provisional ballot for federal offices tabulated was determined by state law governing eligibility, and defendants' directives for determining eligibility on the basis of precinct--based residency were inconsistent with state and federal election law; (4) Michigan election law defined voter qualifications in terms of the voter's home jurisdiction, and a person who cast a			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					provisional ballot within his or her jurisdiction was entitled under federal law to have his or her votes for federal offices counted if eligibility to vote in that election could be verified; and (5) defendants' directives concerning proof of identity of first-time voters who registered by mail were consistent with federal and state law.			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
James v. Bartlett	Supreme Court of North Carolina	359 N.C. 260; 607 S.E.2d 638; 2005 N.C. LEXIS 146	February 4, 2005	Appellant candidates challenged elections in the superior court through appeals of election protests before the North Carolina State Board of Elections and a declaratory judgment action in the superior court. The court entered an order granting summary judgment in favor of appellees, the Board, the Board's executive director, the Board's members, and the North Carolina Attorney General. The candidates appealed.	The case involved three separate election challenges. The central issue was whether a provisional ballot cast on election day at a precinct other than the voter's correct precinct of residence could be lawfully counted in final election tallies. The superior court held that it could be counted. On appeal, the supreme court determined that state law did not permit out--of--precinct provisional	No	N/A	No

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					ballots to be counted in state and local elections. The candidates failure to challenge the counting of out--of--precinct provisional ballots before the election did not render their action untimely. Reversed and remanded.			
Sandusky County Democratic Party v. Blackwell	United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit	387 F.3d 565; 2004 U.S. App. LEXIS 22320	October 26, 2004	Defendant state appealed from an order of the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Ohio which held that the Help America Vote Act required that voters be permitted to cast	The district court found that HAVA created an individual right to cast a provisional ballot, that this right is individually enforceable under 42	No	N/A	No

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				provisional ballots upon affirming their registration to vote in the county in which they desire to vote and that provisional ballots must be counted as valid ballots when cast in the correct county.	U.S.C.S. § 1983, and that plaintiffs unions and political parties had standing to bring a § 1983 action on behalf of Ohio voters. The court of appeals agreed that the political parties and unions had associational standing to challenge the state's provisional voting directive. Further, the court determined that HAVA was quintessentially about being able to cast a provisional			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>ballot but that the voter casts a provisional ballot at the peril of not being eligible to vote under state law; if the voter is not eligible, the vote will then not be counted.</p> <p>Accordingly, the court of appeals reversed the district court and held that "provisional" ballots cast in a precinct where a voter does not reside and which would be invalid under state law, are not required by the HAVA to be considered</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					legal votes. Affirmed in part and reversed in part.			
State ex rel. Mackey v. Blackwell	Supreme Court of Ohio	106 Ohio St. 3d 261; 2005 Ohio 4789; 834 N.E.2d 346; 2005 Ohio LEXIS 2074	September 28, 2005	Appellants, a political group and county electors who voted by provisional ballot, sought review of a judgment from the court of appeals which dismissed appellants' complaint, seeking a writ of mandamus to prevent appellees, the Ohio Secretary of State, a county board of elections, and the board's director, from disenfranchisement of provisional ballot voters.	The Secretary of State issued a directive to all Ohio county boards of elections, which specified that a signed affirmation statement was necessary for the counting of a provisional ballot in a presidential election. During the election, over 24,400 provisional ballots were cast in one county. The electors' provisional	No	N/A	No

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					ballots were not counted. They, together with a political activist group, brought the mandamus action to compel appellants to prohibit the invalidation of provisional ballots and to notify voters of reasons for ballot rejections. Assorted constitutional and statutory law was relied on in support of the complaint. The trial court dismissed the complaint, finding that no clear legal right was established			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					under Ohio law and the federal claims could be adequately raised in an action under 42 U.S.C.S. § 1983. On appeal, the Ohio Supreme Court held that dismissal was proper, as the complaint actually sought declaratory and injunctive relief, rather than mandamus relief. Further, election--contest actions were the exclusive remedy to challenge election results. An adequate remedy existed			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					under § 1983 to raise the federal-law claims. Affirmed.			
Fla. Democratic Party v. Hood	United States District Court for the Northern District of Florida	342 F. Supp. 2d 1073; 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 21720	October 21, 2004	Plaintiff political party sought injunctive relief under the Help America Vote Act, claiming that the election system put in place by defendant election officials violated HAVA because it did not allow provisional voting other than in the voter's assigned precinct. The officials moved for judgment on the pleadings.	The political party asserted that a prospective voter in a federal election had the right to cast a provisional ballot at a given polling place, even if the local officials asserted that the voter was at the wrong polling place; second, that voter had the right to have that vote counted in the election, if the voter otherwise	No	N/A	No

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					met all requirements of state law. The court noted that the right to vote was clearly protectable as a civil right, and a primary purpose of the HAVA was to preserve the votes of persons who had incorrectly been removed from the voting rolls, and thus would not be listed as voters at what would otherwise have been the correct polling place. The irreparable injury to a voter was easily sufficient to			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>outweigh any harm to the officials. Therefore, the court granted relief as to the first claim, allowing the unlisted voter to cast a provisional ballot, but denied relief as to the second claim, that the ballot at the wrong place must be counted if it was cast at the wrong place, because that result contradicted State law. The provisional ballot could only be counted if it</p>			

010171

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					was cast in the proper precinct under State law.			
League of Women Voters v. Blackwell	United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio	340 F. Supp. 2d 823; 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 20926	October 20, 2004	Plaintiff organizations filed suit against defendant, Ohio's Secretary of State, claiming that a directive issued by the Secretary contravened the provisions of the Help America Vote Act. The Secretary filed a motion to dismiss.	The directive in question instructed election officials to issue provisional ballots to first-time voters who registered by mail but did not provide documentary identification at the polling place on election day. When submitting a provisional ballot, a first-time voter could identify himself by providing his driver's license number or the	No	N/A	No

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					last four digits of his social security number. If he did not know either number, he could provide it before the polls closed. If he did not do so, his provisional ballot would not be counted. The court held that the directive did not contravene the HAVA and otherwise established reasonable requirements for confirming the identity of first-time voters who registered to vote by mail because: (1) the			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					identification procedures were an important bulwark against voter misconduct and fraud; (2) the burden imposed on first--time voters to confirm their identity, and thus show that they were voting legitimately, was slight; and (3) the number of voters unable to meet the burden of proving their identity was likely to be very small. Thus, the balance of interests favored the directive,			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					even if the cost, in terms of uncounted ballots, was regrettable.			
Sandusky County Democratic Party v. Blackwell	United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit	386 F.3d 815; 2004 U.S. App. LEXIS 28765	October 23, 2004	Defendant Ohio Secretary of State challenged an order of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio, which held that Ohio Secretary of State Directive 2004--33 violated the federal Help America Vote Act. In its order, the district court directed the Secretary to issue a revised directive that conformed to HAVA's requirements.	On appeal, the court held that the district court correctly ruled that the right to cast a provisional ballot in federal elections was enforceable under 42 U.S.C.S. § 1983 and that at least one plaintiff had standing to enforce that right in the district court. The court also held that Ohio Secretary of State Directive	No	N/A	No

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					2004--33 violated HAVA to the extent that it failed to ensure that any individual affirming that he or she was a registered voter in the jurisdiction in which he or she desired to vote and eligible to vote in a federal election was permitted to cast a provisional ballot. However, the district court erred in holding that HAVA required that a voter's provisional ballot be counted as a			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					valid ballot if it was cast anywhere in the county in which the voter resided, even if it was cast outside the precinct in which the voter resided.			
Hawkins v. Blunt	United States District Court for the Western District of Missouri	2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 21512	October 12, 2004	In an action filed by plaintiffs, voters and a state political party, contending that the provisional voting requirements of Mo. Rev. Stat. § 115.430 conflicted with and was preempted by the Help America Vote Act, plaintiffs and defendants, the secretary of state and others, moved	The court held that the text of the HAVA, as well as its legislative history, proved that it could be read to include reasonable accommodations of state precinct voting practices in implementing provisional voting requirements.	No	N/A	No

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				for summary judgment.	The court further held that Mo. Rev. Stat. § 115.430.2 was reasonable; to effectuate the HAVA's intent and to protect that interest, it could not be unreasonable to direct a voter to his correct voting place where a full ballot was likely to be cast. The court also held that plaintiffs' equal protection rights were not violated by the requirement that before a voter would be allowed to cast a provisional			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					ballot, the voter would first be directed to his proper polling place.			
Bay County Democratic Party v. Land	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan	340 F. Supp. 2d 802; 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 20551	October 13, 2004	Plaintiffs, state and county Democratic parties, filed an action against defendant, Michigan secretary of state and the Michigan director of elections, alleging that the state's intended procedure for casting and counting provisional ballots at the upcoming general election would violate the Help America Vote Act and state laws implementing the federal	The parties claimed that if the secretary's proposed procedure was allowed to occur, several voters who were members of the parties' respective organizations were likely to be disenfranchised. Defendants moved to transfer venue of the action to the Western District of Michigan claiming that the only proper	No	N/A	No

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				legislation. Defendants filed a motion to transfer venue.	venue for an action against a state official is the district that encompasses the state's seat of government. Alternatively, defendants sought transfer for the convenience of the parties and witnesses. The court found that defendants' arguments were not supported by the plain language of the current venue statutes. Federal actions against the Michigan secretary of state over rules and practices			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					governing federal elections traditionally were brought in both the Eastern and Western Districts of Michigan. There was no rule that required such actions to be brought only in the district in which the state's seat of government was located, and no inconvenience resulting from litigating in the state's more populous district reasonably could be claimed by a state official who had a			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					mandate to administer elections throughout the state and operated an office in each of its counties. Motion denied.			
Bay County Democratic Party v. Land	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan	347 F. Supp. 2d 404; 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 20872	October 19, 2004	Plaintiffs, voter organizations and political parties, filed actions against defendants, the Michigan Secretary of State and her director of elections, challenging directives issued to local election officials concerning the casting and tabulation of provisional ballots. Plaintiffs sought a	The court concluded that (1) plaintiffs had standing to assert their claims; (2) HAVA created individual rights enforceable through 42 U.S.C.S. § 1983; (3) Congress had provided a scheme under HAVA in which a voter's right to have a	No	N/A	No

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				preliminary injunction and contended that the directives violated their rights under the Help America Vote Act.	provisional ballot for federal offices tabulated was determined by state law governing eligibility, and defendants' directives for determining eligibility on the basis of precinct--based residency were inconsistent with state and federal election law; (4) Michigan election law defined voter qualifications in terms of the voter's home jurisdiction, and a person who cast a			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					provisional ballot within his or her jurisdiction was entitled under federal law to have his or her votes for federal offices counted if eligibility to vote in that election could be verified; and (5) defendants' directives concerning proof of identity of first-time voters who registered by mail were consistent with federal and state law.			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
Weber v. Shelley	United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit	347 F.3d 1101; 2003 U.S. App. LEXIS 21979	October 28, 2003	Plaintiff voter brought an suit against defendants, the secretary of state and the county registrar of voters, claiming that the lack of a voter--verified paper trail in the county's newly installed touchscreen voting system violated her rights to equal protection and due process. The United States District Court for the Central District of California granted the	On review, the voter contended that use of paperless touch--screen voting systems was unconstitutional and that the trial court erred by ruling her expert testimony inadmissible. The trial court focused on whether the experts' declarations raised genuine issues of material fact about the relative accuracy of the voting systemat issue and excluded references to news--paper articles and unidentified studies absent any indication that	No	N/A	No

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				secretary and the registrar summary judgment. The voter appealed.	experts normally relied upon them. The appellate court found that the trial court's exclusions were not an abuse of discretion and agreed that the admissible opinions which were left did not tend to show that voters had a lesser chance of having their votes counted. It further found that the use of touchscreen voting systems was not subject to strict scrutiny simply because this particular balloting system might make the possibility of some kinds of fraud more difficult to detect. California			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					made a reasonable, politically neutral and non--discriminatory choice to certify touchscreen systems as an alternative to paper ballots, as did the county in deciding to use such a system. Nothing in the Constitution forbid this choice. The judgment was affirmed.			
Am. Ass'n of People with Disabilities v. Shelley	United States District Court for the Central District of California	324 F. Supp. 2d 1120; 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 12587	July 6, 2004	Plaintiffs, disabled voters and organizations representing those voters, sought to enjoin the directives of defendant California	The voters urged the invalidation of the Secretary's directives because, allegedly, their effect was to deprive the voters of the opportunity to vote using touch-screen technology. Although it was not	No	N/A	No

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				Secretary of State, which decertified and withdrew approval of the use of certain direct recording electronic (DRE) voting systems. One voter applied for a temporary restraining order, or, in the alternative, a preliminary injunction. of a preliminary injunction in a number of ways, including a four--part test that considers (1) likelihood of success on	disputed that some disabled persons would be unable to vote independently and in private without the use of DREs, it was clear that they would not be deprived of their fundamental right to vote. The Americans with Disabilities Act, did not require accommodation that would enable disabled persons to vote in a manner that was comparable in every way with the voting rights enjoyed by persons without disabilities. Rather, it mandated that voting programs be made			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				the merits; (2) the possibility of irreparable injury in the absence of an injunction; (3) a balancing of the harms; and (4) the public interest.	accessible. Defendant's decision to suspend the use of DREs pending improvement in their reliability and security of the devices was a rational one, designed to protect the voting rights of the state's citizens. The evidence did not support the conclusion that the elimination of the DREs would have a discriminatory effect on the visually or manually impaired. Thus, the voters showed little likelihood of success on the merits. The			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					individual's request for a temporary restraining order, or, in the alternative, a preliminary injunction, was denied. Ninth Circuit's tests for a preliminary injunction, although phrased differently, require a court to inquire into whether there exists a likelihood of success on the merits, and the possibility of irreparable injury; a court is also required to balance the hardships.			
Fla. Democratic Party v. Hood	Court of Appeal of Florida, First	884 So. 2d 1148; 2004 Fla. App.	October 28, 2004	Petitioner, the Florida Democratic Party, sought	The Party argued that: (1) the Florida Administrative Code, recast	No	N/A	No

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
	District	LEXIS 16077		review of an emergency rule adopted by the Florida Department of State, contending that the findings of immediate danger, necessity, and procedural fairness on which the rule was based were insufficient under Florida law, which required a showing of such circumstances, and Florida case law. This matter followed.	language from the earlier invalidated rule prohibiting a manual recount of overvotes and undervotes cast on a touchscreen machine; (2) the rule did not call for the manual recount of votes to determine voter intent; and (3) the rule created voters who were entitled to manual recounts in close elections and those who were not. The appeals court disagreed. The Department was clearly concerned with the fact that if no rule were in place, the same confusion and inconsistency in			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					divining a voter's intent that attended the 2000 presidential election in Florida, and the same constitutional problems the United States Supreme Court addressed then, might recur in 2004. It was not the court's responsibility to decide the validity of the rule or whether other means were more appropriate. But, the following question was certified to the Supreme Court: Whether under Fla. Stat. ch. 120.54(4), the Department of			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					State set forth sufficient justification for an emergency rule establishing standards for conducting manual recounts of overvotes and undervotes as applied to touchscreen voting systems? The petition was denied, but a question was certified to the supreme court as a matter of great public importance.			
Wexler v. Lepore	United States District Court for the Southern District of	342 F. Supp. 2d 1097; 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 21344	October 25, 2004	Plaintiffs, a congressman, state commissioners, and a registered voter, brought	The officials claimed that the state had established an updated standard for manual recounts in counties using	No	N/A	No

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
	Florida			a § 1983 action against defendants, state officials, alleging that the manual recount procedures for the state's touchscreen paperless voting systems violated their rights under U.S. Const. amends. V and XIV. A bench trial ensued.	optical scan systems and touchscreen voting systems, therefore, alleviating equal protection concerns. The court held that the rules prescribing what constituted a clear indication on the ballot that the voter had made a definite choice, as well the rules prescribing additional recount procedures for each certified voting system promulgated pursuant to Florida law complied with equal protection requirements under U.S. Const. amends. V and XIV because the rules			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					prescribed uniform, nondifferential standards for what constituted a legal vote under each certified voting system, as well as procedures for conducting a manual recount of overvotes and undervotes in the entire geographic jurisdiction. The court further held that the ballot images printed during a manual recount pursuant to Florida Administrative Code did not violate Florida law because the manual recount scheme properly reflected a voter's choice.			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					Judgment was entered for the officials. The claims of the congressman, commissioners, and voter were denied.			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
Spencer v. Blackwell	United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio	347 F. Supp. 2d 528; 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 22062	November 1, 2004	Plaintiff voters filed a motion for temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction seeking to restrain defendant election officials and intervenor State of Ohio from discriminating against black voters in Hamilton County on the basis of race. If necessary, they sought to restrain challengers from being allowed at the polls.	The voters alleged that defendants had combined to implement a voter challenge system at the polls that discriminated against African--American voters. Each precinct was run by its election judges but Ohio law also allowed challengers to be physically present in the polling places in order to challenge voters' eligibility to vote. The court held that the injury asserted, that allowing challengers to challenge voters' eligibility would place an undue burden on voters and impede their	No	N/A	No

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					right to vote, was not speculative and could be redressed by removing the challengers. The court held that in the absence of any statutory guidance whatsoever governing the procedures and limitations for challenging voters by challengers, and the questionable enforceability of the State's and County's policies regarding good faith challenges and ejection of disruptive challengers from the polls, there existed an enormous risk of chaos, delay, intimidation, and			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					pandemonium inside the polls and in the lines out the door. Furthermore, the law allowing private challengers was not narrowly tailored to serve Ohio's compelling interest in preventing voter fraud. The court enjoined all defendants from allowing any challengers other than election judges and other electors into the polling places throughout the state on Election Day.			
MARIAN SPENCER, et al., Petitioners v. CLARA PUGH, et al.	United States Supreme Court	125 S. Ct. 305; 160 L. Ed. 2d 213;	November 2, 2004	In two separate actions, plaintiffs sued defendant members of a political party,	Plaintiffs contended that the members planned to send numerous challengers to	No	N/A	No

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
(No. 04A360) SUMMIT COUNTY DEMOCRATIC CENTRAL and EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, et al., Petitioners v. MATTHEW HEIDER, et al. (No. 04A364)		2004 U.S. LEXIS 7400		alleging that the members planned to mount indiscriminate challenges in polling places which would disrupt voting. Plaintiffs applied to vacate orders entered by the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit which entered emergency stays of injunctions restricting the members' activities.	polling places in predominantly African--American neighborhoods to challenge votes in an imminent national election, which would allegedly cause voter intimidation and inordinate delays in voting. A district court ordered challengers to stay out of polling places, and another district court ordered challengers to remain in the polling places only as witnesses, but the appellate court stayed the orders. The United States Supreme Court, acting through a			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					single Circuit Justice, declined to reinstate the injunctions for prudential reasons, despite the few hours left until the upcoming election. While the allegations of abuse were serious, it was not possible to determine with any certainty the ultimate validity of the plaintiffs' claims or for the full Supreme Court to review the relevant submissions, and voting officials would be available to enable proper voting by qualified voters.			
Charles H. Wesley Educ.	United States	324 F. Supp. 2d	July 1, 2004	Plaintiffs, a voter, fraternity members,	The organization participated in	No	N/A	No

010201

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
Found., Inc. v. Cox	District Court for the Northern District of Georgia	1358; 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 12120		and an organization, sought an injunction ordering defendant, the Georgia Secretary of State, to process the voter registration application forms that they mailed in following a voter registration drive. They contended that by refusing to process the forms defendants violated the National Voter Registration Act and U.S. Const. amends. I, XIV, and XV.	numerous non--partisan voter registration drives primarily designed to increase the voting strength of African--Americans. Following one such drive, the fraternity members mailed in over 60 registration forms, including one for the voter who had moved within state since the last election. The Georgia Secretary of State's office refused to process them because they were not mailed individually and neither a registrar, deputy registrar, or an otherwise authorized person			

010202

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					had collected the applications as required under state law. The court held that plaintiffs had standing to bring the action. The court held that because the applications were received in accordance with the mandates of the NVRA, the State of Georgia was not free to reject them. The court found that: plaintiffs had a substantial likelihood of prevailing on the merits of their claim that the applications were improperly rejected; plaintiffs would be irreparably injured absent an			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					injunction; the potential harm to defendants was outweighed by plaintiffs' injuries; and an injunction was in the public interest. Injunction granted.			
Jacksonville Coalition for Voter Prot. v. Hood	United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida	351 F. Supp. 2d 1326; 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 26522	October 25, 2004	Plaintiffs, voter protection coalition, union, and voters, filed an emergency motion for a preliminary injunction and argued that African Americans in the county had less opportunity than other members of the state's electorate to vote in the upcoming election, and that defendants, elections officials',	The coalition, the union, and the voters based their claim on the fact that the county had the largest percentage of African--American registered voters of any major county in the state, and, yet, other similarly-sized counties with smaller African--American registered voter percentages had more early voting sites. Based	No	N/A	No

010204

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				implementation of early voting procedures violated the Voting Rights Act and their constitutional rights.	on that, they argued that African-- American voters in the county were disproportionately affected. The court found that while it may have been true that having to drive to an early voting site and having to wait in line may cause people to be inconvenienced, inconvenience did not result in a denial of meaningful access to the political process. Thus, the coalition, the union, and the voters had not established a likelihood of success on the merits of their claim that the county's			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					implementation of early voting procedures violated § 2 of the Voting Rights Act. Moreover, the coalition, the union, and the voters failed to establish a likelihood of success on the merits of their § 1983 Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendment claims, which required a higher proof of discriminatory purpose and effect. Injunction denied.			
Taylor v. Howe	United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit	225 F.3d 993; 2000 U.S. App. LEXIS 22241	August 31, 2000	Plaintiffs, African American voters, poll watchers, and candidates appealed from a judgment of the United States	The court of appeals affirmed--in--part, reversed--in--part, and remanded the district court's judgment. The court found that the	No	N/A	No

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				District Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas in favor of defendants, elections commissioners and related individuals, on their § 1983 voting rights claims and contended the district court made erroneous findings of fact and law and failed to appreciate evidence of discriminatory intent.	district court's finding of a lack of intentional discrimination was appropriate as to many defendants. However, as to some of the individual voters' claims for damages, the court held "a definite and firm conviction" that the district court's findings were mistaken. The court noted that the argument that a voter's name was misspelled in the voter register, with a single incorrect letter, was a flimsy pretext and, accordingly, held that the district court's finding that			

010207

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					defendant poll workers did not racially discriminate in denying the vote to this plaintiff was clearly erroneous. Affirmed in part and reversed in part.			
Stewart v. Blackwell	United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio	356 F. Supp. 2d 791; 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 26897	December 14, 2004	Plaintiffs, including African--American voters, alleged that use of punch card voting and "central-count" optical scanning devices by defendants, the Ohio Secretary of State et al., violated their rights under the Due Process Clause, the Equal Protection Clause, and (African--American plaintiffs) their rights under § 2 of the Voting Rights	The primary thrust of the litigation was an attempt to federalize elections by judicial rule or fiat via the invitation to the court to declare a certain voting technology unconstitutional and then fashion a remedy. The court declined the invitation. The determination of the applicable voting process had always been focused in the	No	N/A	No

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				Act.	legislative branch of the government. While it was true that the percentage of residual or non-voted ballots in the 2000 presidential election ran slightly higher in counties using punch card technology, that fact standing alone was insufficient to declare the use of the system unconstitutional. Moreover, the highest frequency in Ohio of residual voting bore a direct relationship to economic and educational factors, negating the Voting Rights Act claim. The court further stated that local			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					variety in voting technology did not violate the Equal Protection Clause, even if the different technologies had different levels of effectiveness in recording voters' intentions, so long as there was some rational basis for the technology choice. It concluded that defendants' cost and security reasons for the use of punch card ballots were plausible.			
Taylor v. Currie	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan	386 F. Supp. 2d 929; 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 20257	September 14, 2005	Plaintiff brought an action against defendants, including a city elections commission, alleging defects in a city council	This action involved issues pertaining to absentee ballots. Plaintiff alleged that defendants were not complying with state laws requiring certain eligibility	No	N/A	No

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				<p>primary election pertaining to absentee balloting. The case was removed to federal court by defendants. Pending before the court was a motion to remand, filed by plaintiff.</p>	<p>checks before issuing absentee ballots. The state court issued an injunction preventing defendants from mailing absentee ballots. Defendants removed the action to federal court and plaintiff sought a remand. Defendants argued that not mailing the absentee ballots would violate the Voting Rights Act, because it would place a restriction only on the City of Detroit, which was predominately African--American. The court ordered the case remanded because it found no</p>			

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					basis under 28 U.S.C.S. §§ 1441 or 1443 for federal jurisdiction. Defendants' mere reference to a federal law or federal right was not enough to confer subject matter jurisdiction where the complaint sought to assert only rights arising under state statutes against state officials in relation to a state election. The court stated that it would not allow defendants to take haven in federal court under the guise of providing equal protection for the citizens of Detroit but with a			

010212

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					goal of perpetuating their violation of a non-discriminatory state law. Motion to remand granted.			

Methodology for Case Review

In order to properly identify all applicable cases the consultants first developed an extensive word search term list. A West Law search was performed and the first one hundred cases under each word search term were then gathered in individual files. This resulted in a total of approximately 44,000 cases. Most of these cases were federal as opposed to state and appellate as opposed to trial.

Consultant Serebrov analyzed the cases in each file to determine if they were on point. If he found that the first twenty cases were inapplicable, Serebrov would sample forty to fifty other file cases at random to determine applicability. If the entire file did not yield any cases, the file would be discarded. All discarded word search terms were recorded in a separate file. Likewise, if the file only yielded a few applicable cases, it would also be discarded. However, if a small but significant number of cases were on point, the file was later charted.

The results of the case search were stark because relatively few applicable cases were found. Consultant Serebrov recommends that a selective regional, state district court search be preformed in the second phase of this project

**Rough Summary of Department of Justice, Public Integrity Section Activities,
October 2002-January 2006**

Prosecutions and Convictions-- Individuals

Noncitizen voting: 20
Vote buying: 49
Double voting: 12
Registration fraud: 13
Civil Rights: 4
Voter Intimidation: 2
Unclear: 1

Open Investigations (note: a few cases overlap with prosecutions and convictions)

Noncitizen voting: 3
Vote buying: 25
Double voting: 15
Registration fraud: 29
Absentee ballot fraud: 9
Official: 8
Ineligibles: 4
Deceptive Practices: 1
Civil Rights: 14
Intimidation: 6
Other: 2

Cases and Investigations Closed for Lack of Evidence

Civil Rights: 8
Official: 12
Registration Fraud: 12
Absentee Ballot Fraud: 14
Ineligible Voting: 3
Intimidation: 8
Double Voting: 5
Ballot Box Stuffing: 1
Vote Buying: 14
Ballot/machine tampering: 2
Other: 8
Unclear: 3

Major Vote Buying Cases Summary

Between 2001 and 2006, allegations and convictions for vote buying and conspiracies to buy votes were concentrated in three states: Illinois, West Virginia and Kentucky.

In **East St. Louis, Illinois**, nine individuals, including a former city council member and the head of the local Democratic Party, Charles Powell, Jr., were convicted or pled guilty to vote buying and conspiracy to commit election fraud during the 2004 general election. The government's conspiracy case was almost entirely based on taped conversations in which the defendants discussed buying votes for \$5 and whether this would be adequate. Federal prosecutors alleged that the vote buying was financed with \$79,000 transferred from the County Democratic Party shortly before the election, although county officials have not been charged. Four defendants were convicted of purchasing or offering to purchase at least one vote directly, while Democratic Party chairman was only convicted of conspiracy.¹ Earlier, three precinct officials and one precinct worker pled guilty to buying votes for \$5 or \$10 in that same election.²

Eastern Kentucky has witnessed a series of vote buying cases over the last several years. The most recent revolved around Ross Harris, a Pike County political fundraiser and coal executive, and his associate Loren Glenn Turner. Harris and Turner were convicted in September 2004 of vote buying, mail fraud, and several other counts.³ Prosecutors alleged Harris and Turner conspired to buy votes and provided the necessary funds in an unsuccessful 2002 bid for Pike County district judge by former State Senator Doug Hays. Harris supplied nearly \$40,000, Turner laundered the money through straw contributors, and the cash was then disbursed in the form of \$50 checks ostensibly for 'vote hauling', the legal practice of paying campaign workers to get voters to the polls which is notorious as a cover for buying votes.⁴ Harris attempted to influence the race on behalf of Hays in order to get revenge on Hays' opponent for a personal matter.⁵

A grand jury initially indicted 10 individuals in connection with the Harris and Turner case, including Hays and his wife, and six campaign workers. Of the remaining defendants, only one, Tom Varney, also a witness in the Hays case, pled guilty. The others were either acquitted of vote buying charges or had vote buying charges dropped.⁶ Prosecutors have announced that their investigation continues into others tied to Harris and may produce further indictments.

The Harris case follows a series of trials related to the 1998 Knott County Democratic primary. Between 2003 and 2004, 10 individuals were indicted on vote buying charges, including a winning candidate in those primaries, Knott County judge-executive Donnie Newsome, who was reelected in 2002. In 2004 Newsome and a supporter were sent to jail and fined. Five other

¹ "Five convicted in federal vote-fraud trial" Associated Press, June 30, 2005; "Powell gets 21 months" Belleville News-Democrat, March 1, 2006.

² "Four Plead Guilty To Vote-Buying Cash Was Allegedly Supplied By St. Clair Democratic Machine" Belleville News-Democrat, March 23, 2005.

³ "2 found guilty in pike county vote-fraud case; Two-year sentences possible," Lexington Herald Leader, September 17, 2004.

⁴ "Jury weighing vote-fraud case," Lexington Herald Leader, September 16, 2004.

⁵ "Pike Election Trial Goes To Jury" Lexington Herald Leader, January 1, 2006.

⁶ "Former state senator acquitted of vote buying," Lexington Herald Leader, November 2, 2004.

defendants pled guilty to vote buying charges, and three were acquitted. The primary means of vote buying entailed purchasing absentee votes from elderly, infirm, illiterate or poor voters, usually for between \$50 and \$100. This resulted in an abnormally high number of absentee ballots in the primary.⁷ Indictments relating to that same 1998 primary were also brought in 1999, when 6 individuals were indicted for buying the votes of students at a small local college. Five of those indicted were convicted or pled guilty.⁸

Absentee vote buying was also an issue in 2002, when federal prosecutors opened an investigation in Kentucky's Clay County after an abnormal number of absentee ballots were filed in the primary and the sheriff halted absentee voting twice over concerns.⁹ Officials received hundreds of complaints of vote-buying during the 2002 primary, and state investigators performed follow up investigations in a number of counties, including Knott, Bell, Floyd, Pike, and Maginoff.¹⁰ No indictments have been produced so far.

So far, relatively few incidents of vote-buying have been substantially identified or investigated in the 2004 election. Two instances of vote buying in local 2004 elections have been brought before a grand jury. In one, a Casey County man was indicted for purchasing votes in a local school board race with cash and whiskey.¹¹ In the second, the grand jury chose not to indict an individual accused of offering to purchase a teenager's vote on a local proposal with beer.¹²

An extensive vote buying conspiracy has also been uncovered in southern **West Virginia**. The federal probe, which handed down its first indictment in 2003, has yielded more than a dozen guilty pleas to charges of vote buying and conspiracy in elections since the late 1980s. As this area is almost exclusively dominated by the Democratic Party, vote-buying occurred largely during primary contests.

The first phase of the probe focused on Logan County residents, where vote buying charges were brought in relation to elections in 1996, 2000, 2002 and 2004. In an extraordinary tactic, the FBI planted the former mayor of Logan City, Tom Esposito, as a candidate in a state legislative race. Esposito's cooperation led to guilty pleas from the Logan County Clerk, who pled guilty to selling his vote to Esposito in 1996,¹³ and another man who took money from Esposito for the purpose of vote buying in 2004.¹⁴

Guilty pleas were also obtained in connection with former county sheriff Johnny Mendez, who pled guilty to buying votes in two primary elections in order to elect candidates including

⁷ "Knott County, KY., Judge Executive sentenced on vote-buying conspiracy charges," Department of Justice, March 16, 2004.

⁸ "6 men accused of vote fraud in '98 Knott primary; Charges include vote buying and lying to FBI"

⁹ "Election 2002: ABSENTEE BALLOTING; State attorney general's office investigates voting records in some counties" The Courier-Journal, November 7, 2002.

¹⁰ "Election 2002: Kentucky; VOTE FRAUD; Investigators monitor 17 counties across state" The Courier-Journal, November 6, 2002.

¹¹ "Jury finds man guilty on vote-buying charges" Associated Press, November 11, 2005.

¹² "Man in beer vote case files suit" The Cincinnati Enquirer, March 17, 2005.

¹³ "Two plead to vote fraud; Logan clerk sold vote; politician tried to buy votes" Charleston Gazette, December 14, 2005.

¹⁴ "Logan man gets probation in vote-fraud scandal" Charleston Gazette, March 1, 2006.

himself. In 2000, with a large amount of funding from a prominent local lawyer seeking to influence a state delegate election for his wife, Mendez distributed around \$10,000 in payments to voters of \$10 to \$100. Then, in the 2004 primary, Mendez distributed around \$2,000 before his arrest.¹⁵ A deputy of Mendez', the former Logan police chief, also pled guilty to a count of vote buying in 2002.¹⁶

Prosecutors focusing on neighboring Lincoln County have alleged a long-standing vote-buying conspiracy extending back to the late 1980s. The probe identified Lincoln County Circuit Clerk Greg Stowers as head of a Democratic Party faction which routinely bought votes in order to maintain office. Stowers pled guilty in December 2005 to distributing around \$7,000 to buy votes in the 2004 primary. The Lincoln County Assessor, and Stowers' longtime political ally, Jerry Allen Weaver, also pled guilty to conspiracy to buy votes.¹⁷ These were accompanied by four other guilty pleas from party workers for vote buying in primaries. While most specific charges focused on vote buying in the 2004 primary, defendants also admitted buying votes as far back as the 1988, 1990, and 1992 primaries.

The leading conspirators would give party workers candidate slates and cash, which workers would then take to the polling place and use to purchase votes for amounts between \$10 and \$40 and in one instance, for liquor. Voters would be handed the slate of chosen candidates, and would then be paid upon exiting the polling place. In other cases, the elected officials in question purchased votes in exchange for non-cash rewards, including patronage positions, fixed tickets, favorable tax assessments, and home improvements.¹⁸

The West Virginia probe is ongoing, as prosecutors are scrutinizing others implicated during the proceedings so far, including a sitting state delegate, who may be under scrutiny for vote buying in a 1990 election, and one of the Lincoln county defendants who previously had vote buying charges against him dropped.¹⁹

¹⁵ "Mendez confined to home for year Ex-Logan sheriff was convicted of buying votes" Charleston Gazette, January 22, 2005.

¹⁶ "Ex-Logan police sentenced for buying votes" Associated Press, February 15, 2005.

¹⁷ "Clerk says he engaged in vote buying" Charleston Gazette, December 30, 2005.

¹⁸ "Lincoln clerk, two others plead guilty to election fraud" Charleston Daily Mail, December 30, 2005.

¹⁹ "Next phase pondered in federal vote-buying probe" Associated Press, January 1, 2006.

Case Summaries

After reviewing over 40,000 cases, the majority of which came from appeals courts, I have found comparatively very few which are applicable to this study. Of those that are applicable, no apparent thematic pattern emerges. However, it seems that the greatest areas of fraud and intimidation have shifted from past patterns of stealing votes to present problems with voter registration, voter identification, the proper delivery and counting of absentee and overseas ballots, provisional voting, vote buying, and challenges to felon eligibility. But because so few cases provided a picture of these current problems, I suggest that case research for the second phase of this project concentrate on state trial-level decisions.

Job Serebrov
May 2006

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research
Absentee Balloting Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
Powers v. Donahue	Supreme Court of New York, Appellate Division, First Department	276 A.D.2d 157; 717 N.Y.S.2d 550; 2000 N.Y. App. Div. LEXIS 12644	December 5, 2000	Petitioner appealed an order of the supreme court, which denied his motion to direct the New York County Board of Elections, in cases where more than one absentee ballot was returned by a voter, to count only the absentee ballot listing correct candidates' names.	When the New York County Board of Elections learned some absentee ballots mailed to voters in one district listed the wrong candidates for state senator it sent a second set of absentee ballots to absentee voters informing them the first ballot was defective and requesting they use the second ballot. The board agreed if two ballots were received from the same voter, only the corrected ballot would be counted.	No	N/A	No

010220

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research
Absentee Balloting Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					Appellant candidate moved in support of the board's determination. Respondent candidate opposed the application, contending that only the first ballot received should have been canvassed. The trial court denied appellant's motion, ruling that pursuant to New York law, where two ballots were received from the same voter, only the ballot with the earlier date was to be accepted. The court found the			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research
Absentee Balloting Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					local board officials should have resolved the dispute as they proposed. The order was modified and the motion granted to the extent of directing the New York County Board of Elections, in cases where more than one absentee ballot was returned by a voter, to accept only the corrected ballot postmarked on or before November 7, 2000, and otherwise affirmed.			
Goodwin v. St. Thomas--	Territorial Court of the	43 V.I. 89; 2000	December 13, 2000	Plaintiff political	Plaintiff alleged that defendants	No	N/A	No

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research
Absentee Balloting Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
St. John Bd. of Elections	Virgin Islands	V.I. LEXIS 15		candidate alleged that certain general election absentee ballots violated territorial election law, and that the improper inclusion of such ballots by defendants, election board and supervisor, resulted in plaintiff's loss of the election. Plaintiff sued defendants seeking invalidation of the absentee ballots and certification of the election results	counted unlawful absentee ballots that lacked postmarks, were not signed or notarized, were in unsealed and/or torn envelopes, and were in envelopes containing more than one ballot. Prior to tabulation of the absentee ballots, plaintiff was leading intervenor for the final senate position, but the absentee ballots entitled intervenor to the position. The court held that plaintiff was not entitled to relief since he failed to			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research
Absentee Balloting Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				tabulated without such ballots.	establish that the alleged absentee voting irregularities would require invalidation of a sufficient number of ballots to change the outcome of the election. While the unsealed ballots constituted a technical violation, the outer envelopes were sealed and thus substantially complied with election requirements. Further, while defendants improperly counted one ballot where a sealed ballot			

010224

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research
Absentee Balloting Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					envelope and a loose ballot were in the same outer envelope, the one vote involved did not change the election result. Plaintiff's other allegations of irregularities were without merit since ballots without postmarks were valid, ballots without signatures were not counted, and ballots without notarized signatures were proper. Request for declaratory and injunctive relief denied.			
Townson v. Stonicher	Supreme Court of Alabama	2005 Ala. LEXIS	December 9, 2005	The circuit court	The voters and the incumbent all	No	N/A	No

010225

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research
Absentee Balloting Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
		214		overturned the results of a mayoral election after reviewing the absentee ballots cast for said election, resulting in a loss for appellant incumbent based on the votes received from appellee voters. The incumbent appealed, and the voters cross-- appealed. In the meantime, the trial court stayed enforcement of its judgment pending	challenged the judgment entered by the trial court arguing that it impermissibly included or excluded certain votes. The appeals court agreed with the voters that the trial court should have excluded the votes of those voters for the incumbent who included an improper form of identification with their absentee ballots. It was undisputed that at least 30 absentee voters who voted for the incumbent provided with			

010226

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research
Absentee Balloting Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				resolution of the appeal.	their absentee ballots a form of identification that was not proper under Alabama law. As a result, the court further agreed that the trial court erred in allowing those voters to somewhat "cure" that defect by providing a proper form of identification at the trial of the election contest, because, under those circumstances, it was difficult to conclude that those voters made an honest effort to comply with the law. Moreover, to			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research
Absentee Balloting Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					count the votes of voters who failed to comply with the essential requirement of submitting proper identification with their absentee ballots had the effect of disenfranchising qualified electors who choose not to vote but rather than to make the effort to comply with the absentee-voting requirements. Affirmed.			
Gross v. Albany County Bd. of Elections	Supreme Court of New York, Appellate Division, Third Department	10 A.D.3d 476; 781 N.Y.S.2d 172; 2004 N.Y. App. Div. LEXIS	August 23, 2004	Appellant candidates appealed from a judgment entered by the supreme court, which partially	The candidates argued that the Board violated a federal court order regarding the election. The appellate court	No	N/A	No

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research
Absentee Balloting Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
		10360		granted the candidates' petition challenging the method used by respondent Albany County Board of Elections for counting absentee applications and ballots for the office of Albany County Legislator, 26th and 29th Districts, in a special general election required by the federal courts.	held that absentee ballots that were sent to voters for the special general election based solely on their applications for the general election were properly voided. The Board had no authority to issue the ballots without an absentee ballot application for the special general election. Two ballots were properly invalidated as the Board failed to retain the envelopes. Ballots were properly counted for voters who failed to			

010229

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research
Absentee Balloting Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					identify their physician on their applications. A ballot was properly counted where the Board failed to scrutinize the sufficiency of the reason for the application. A ballot containing two signatures was properly rejected. A ballot was properly rejected due to extraneous marks outside the voting square. A ballot was properly counted despite the failure of the election inspector to witness the voter's signature. A ballot was			

010230

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research
Absentee Balloting Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					properly counted as the application stated the date of the voter's absence. A ballot was properly counted as the failure to date the application was cured by a time stamp. Affirmed.			
Erlandson v. Kiffmeyer	Supreme Court of Minnesota	659 N.W.2d 724; 2003 Minn. LEXIS 196	April 17, 2003	Petitioners, representing the Democratic--Farmer--Labor Party, brought an action against respondents, the Minnesota Secretary of State and the Hennepin County Auditor, seeking relief	The appellate court found that, while it may have seemed unfair to the replacement candidate to count votes for other candidates from regular absentee ballots on which the replacement candidate did not appear, those were properly cast ballots voting for a properly	No	N/A	No

010231

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research
Absentee Balloting Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				in regard to the election for United States Senator, following the death of Senator Wellstone. The issue concerned the right of absentee voters to obtain replacement ballots. Individuals intervened on behalf of the Republican Party. The instant court granted review.	nominated candidate. Petitioners' request that the Minnesota supreme court order that votes for United States Senator cast on regular absentee ballots not be counted was denied. A key issue was Minn. Stat. § 204B.41 (2002), which provided, in--part, that official supplemental ballots could not be mailed to absent voters to whom ballots were mailed before the official supplemental ballots were			

010232

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research
Absentee Balloting Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					prepared. The supreme court held that, by treating similarly-situated voters differently, § 204B.41 violated equal protection guarantees and could not even survive rational basis review. For voters who cast their regular absentee ballots for Wellstone before the vacancy occurred, but were unable to go to their polling place on election day or pick up a replacement ballot by election day, the prohibition on			

010233

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research
Absentee Balloting Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					mailing replacement ballots in § 204B.41 denied them the right to cast a meaningful vote for United States Senator. The petition of petitioners was denied in part, but granted with respect to mailing replacement ballots to all applicants for regular absentee ballots who requested a replacement ballot.			
People v. Deganutti	Appellate Court of Illinois, First District, Third Division	348 Ill. App. 3d 512; 810 N.E.2d 191; 2004 Ill. App.	May 12, 2004	Defendant appealed from a judgment of the circuit court, which convicted	Defendant went to the voters' homes and obtained their signatures on absentee ballot	No	N/A	No

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research
Absentee Balloting Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
		LEXIS 518		defendant on charges of unlawful observation of voting and on charges of absentee ballot violations in connection with the completion and mailing of the absentee ballots of two voters.	request forms. Once the ballots were mailed to the voters, defendant returned to the homes. With voter one, defendant sat on the couch with the voter and instructed which numbers to punch on the ballot. With voter two, defendant provided a list a numbers and stood nearby as voter two completed the ballots. Defendant then looked at the ballot and had voter two re-- punch a number that had not			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research
Absentee Balloting Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					punched cleanly. Defendant then put the ballots in the mail for the voters. On appeal, she argued insufficient evidence to sustain her convictions. The court affirmed, holding that (1) the circumstantial evidence surrounding defendant's presence as the voters completed their ballots supported the unlawful observation convictions; (2) the fact that defendant knowingly took the voters ballots			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research
Absentee Balloting Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					and mailed them, a violation of Illinois law supported her conviction, and (3) the fact that the statutes defendant was convicted under required only a knowing mental state rather than criminal intent did not violate substantive due process. Affirmed.			
Jacobs v. Seminole County Canvassing Bd.	Supreme Court	773 So. 2d 519; 2000 Fla. LEXIS 2404	December 12, 2000	In an election contest, the First District court of appeal certified a trial court order to be of great public importance and to require	Prior to the general election, two political parties mailed preprinted requests for absentee ballots to registered voters in Seminole County.	No	N/A	No

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research
Absentee Balloting Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				immediate resolution by the supreme court. The trial court denied appellants' request to invalidate absentee ballot requests in Seminole County in the 2000 presidential election.	Forms mailed by one party failed to include either a space for the voter identification number or the preprinted number. Representatives from that party were allowed to add voter identification numbers to request forms after they were returned, and absentee ballots were sent to the persons named on the request forms. The supreme court affirmed the trial court's refusal to invalidate the			

010238

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research
Absentee Balloting Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					<p>ballot requests, and adopted the trial court's reasoning that the information required, which included the voter identification number, was directory rather than mandatory. The trial court properly found that the evidence did not support a finding of fraud, gross negligence, or intentional wrongdoing. Allowing one party to correct ballots did not constitute illegal disparate treatment because there was no need to correct the</p>			

010239

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research
Absentee Balloting Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					other party's forms. Affirmed.			
Gross v. Albany County Bd. of Elections	Court of Appeals of New York	3 N.Y.3d 251; 819 N.E.2d 197; 785 N.Y.S.2d 729; 2004 N.Y. LEXIS 2412	October 14, 2004	Appellant candidates sought review from an order of the Appellate Division, which affirmed a trial court order holding that absentee ballots from a special general election were not to be canvassed because respondent Albany County Board of Elections failed to follow the set procedure for those voters.	Due to a challenge to a redistricting plan, the Board was enjoined from conducting primary and general elections for certain county districts. A special primary election was directed, with a special general election to be held "expeditiously thereafter." Absentee ballot requests for the first special election were based on prior requests, but new requests had to be	No	N/A	No

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research
Absentee Balloting Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					made for the general election. However, the Board forwarded absentee ballots for that election as well, based on the prior requests. Candidates in two close races thereafter challenged those absentee ballots, as they violated the procedure that was to be followed. The trial court held that the ballots should not be canvassed, which decision was affirmed on appeal. On further review due to dissenting opinions, the			

010241

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research
Absentee Balloting Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
					court found that the ballots were in violation of the federal court order that directed the procedure to be followed, as well as in violation of New York election law. The court concluded that the Board's error was not technical, ministerial, or inconsequential because it was central to the substantive process, and the voters who used absentee ballots were not determined to be "duly qualified electors." Affirmed.			

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research
Absentee Balloting Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
In re Canvass of Absentee Ballots of Nov. 4, 2003 Gen. Election	Supreme Court of Pennsylvania	577 Pa. 231; 843 A.2d 1223; 2004 Pa. LEXIS 431	March 8, 2004	A county elections board voided certain absentee ballots cast in the November 4, 2003, general election. The court of common pleas held that absentee ballots delivered by third persons were valid and should be counted. The commonwealth court affirmed the trial court's decision. The state supreme court granted allocatur. Appellants and appellees were certain	The absentee ballots at issue were hand-delivered to the county elections board by third persons on behalf of non--disabled voters. On appeal, the issue was whether non--disabled absentee voters could have third persons hand--deliver their ballots to the elections board where the board indicated that the practice was permitted. The state supreme court concluded that the "in person" delivery requirement was mandatory, and	No	N/A	No

EAC Voting Fraud-Voter Intimidation Preliminary Research
Absentee Balloting Cases

Name of Case	Court	Citation	Date	Facts	Holding	Statutory Basis (if of Note)	Other Notes	Should the Case be Researched Further
				candidates and voters.	that absentee ballots delivered in violation of the provision were invalid, notwithstanding the board's erroneous instructions to the contrary. Under the statute's plain meaning, a non--disabled absentee voter had two choices: send the ballot by mail, or deliver it in person. Third--person hand--delivery of absentee ballots was not permitted. To ignore the law's clear instructions regarding in--person delivery			

010244